

bill that continues to subsidize big agribusiness and special interests and that further subsidizes a crop insurance program that is rife with fraud, waste and abuse, it is just one more cut to a program that helps our most vulnerable neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the November 1 cuts were devastating for 47 million hungry people. Just ask any food bank director in the country. Adding another \$8 billion cut to another 3 million families will cause even more damage. If my friends insist on changing the LIHEAP provision, then they should at least have the decency to reinvest those savings into SNAP.

Both Democrats and Republicans are talking a lot these days about the issue of income inequality. That is a good thing. So why on Earth would we pass a farm bill that makes the rich get richer and the poor get poorer? We can and must do better.

It is a scandal that in the richest country in the history of the world we have a hunger problem. Members of Congress rush to the microphones to promote tax cuts and ease resolutions on Wall Street. All the while, there are people in this country—men, women and kids—who do not have enough to eat. I will oppose any farm bill that makes hunger worse in America, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

In conclusion, let me say to my colleagues: there are some things worth fighting for. Ending hunger—making sure our fellow citizens have enough to eat—is absolutely worth fighting for.

UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, for the last few years, Ukraine has been working towards the signing of an association agreement with the European Union to increase economic and political ties with the bloc and to solidify democratic values and principles. The association agreement was to have been signed on November 28 through 29 at an Eastern Partnership Summit meeting in Vilnius.

On November 21, the Cabinet of Ministers in Ukraine unilaterally suspended negotiations with the European Union due to excessive pressure from Russia. Outraged by this, Ukrainians began to protest by creating European squares, or Euromaidans, across the country, including the capital of Kiev. In the early morning of November 30, the Ukrainian Government sent special forces to clear the Euromaidan in Kiev by using physical force and tear gas, resulting in many protesters and journalists with traumatic injuries and several still who are unaccounted for.

In response to the unprecedented use of force against peaceful protesters in Ukraine's history, several high-ranking deputies and officials in the governing party defected from the Party of Regions. Since then, protests have contin-

ued with a reported 1 million Ukrainians taking to the streets on December 1. Every Sunday since has brought at least 50,000 to the Euromaidan.

In the early morning of December 11, special forces, using chain saws and metal batons, broke through many makeshift barricades made of park benches and other available materials in order to encircle thousands of peaceful protesters on the Euromaidan in Kiev. In a 9-hour standoff with security forces, peaceful protesters on the Euromaidan stood their ground, singing the national anthem and praying every hour with local churches that were ringing their bells in support of the protesters.

In 2013, violence was used against more than 100 journalists in Ukraine, with almost half of the incidents occurring in December. On December 25, a well-known and respected Ukrainian journalist and civic activist, Tetyana Chornovol, was brutally beaten on her way home. Protest leaders tie her beating to her anti-regime reporting. Her severely bruised face is now used as a symbol of government repression.

The United States calls on the Ukrainian Government to respect Ukrainians' freedom of speech, their right to free assembly; and it calls on them to refrain from using force against peaceful protesters.

SUPERFUND SITES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, when I saw that the legislative agenda for this week was going to deal with the beleaguered Superfund program, I was encouraged; but when I saw what my Republican colleagues actually proposed, I was saddened and disappointed.

Across America, we are plagued by a variety of severely polluted hotspots known as "Superfund sites." Many are the legacy of past reckless or clueless business behaviors; Government, itself, shares responsibility as well. Local governments failed to properly zone and regulate businesses with toxic by-products. Sometimes government created problems with the way it operated sewer systems, solid waste management, and military operations.

The Superfund law, created in 1980, with a Superfund tax on the petrochemical industry, which caused the problem, would provide cleanup funding. It was reasonable at that time, but it has been frozen in place for almost 20 years. In 1995, the excise tax expired. Neither the program nor the problems have gone away, and having fewer and fewer resources has not helped. Sadly, the proposals the House will be considering this week would actually reduce the overall amount of funding that is available, undercut standards, and slow cleanup.

The Federal Government has created some of these problems, mostly caused

by military operations, which is the largest single source of Superfund sites in the country, but there are also situations like the TVA and its coal ash disaster.

Instead of enhancing the Federal commitment and capacity, this legislative exercise is an illustration of part of the problem. It is an attempt to look like we are doing something, but it has no chance of being enacted into law; and if it did, it would actually make the problem worse.

It is time for us to renew and refine the Federal commitment, not to complicate and undercut it. We should take a performance-based approach to zero in on what will actually accelerate cleanup in a demonstrable fashion and be able to move away from what has too often been a pro forma response.

The Federal Government should, indeed, clean up after itself and not leave the problem behind. The military should place Superfund cleanup as a higher priority in its budgeting. We have seen recent studies about pollution around military bases, like Camp Lejeune, that has had a severe impact on military families and their neighbors, linking contamination to a series of birth defects like spina bifida and to childhood cancers, including leukemia.

We should renew the Superfund tax, which I will be introducing in legislation this month. The Federal budget allocations should commit to cleanup, not passing the buck. We have settled into a program of sue, stall, and study as the inevitable result of a failure to work together to clean up, to protect the public, and to save money in the long run. I hope we will reject the Republican proposal this week and, instead, make a renewed commitment to find ways to make it work better.

TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on December 26, 2013, President Obama signed into law the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, which sets policy and funding levels for the U.S. Department of Defense.

In large part, the bill went through regular committee order on the House side, with the consideration of amendments from both Republicans and Democrats. A somewhat similar series of actions was taken by the Senate. Despite a small amount of political theater, both Chambers not only found common ground in and passed this important measure, but in placing good policy before politics, Members overcame differences and acted in the best interests of the country—in this case, to the benefit of our men and women in uniform. Mr. Speaker, this is how the institution is supposed to work.

The measure offers our servicemembers resources to safely fulfill their